

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

ADVISORY BOARD:

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. H. Danby. Prof. M. Ginsberg.
Prof. J. Morgenstern. Prof. C. Singer. Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. Rabbi I. I. Mattuck, D.H.L. C. Rabin, D.Phil.
J. L. Teicher, Ph.D.

EDITOR:

J. L. TEICHER, M.A.

HON. TREASURER:

LEON REES

HON. SECRETARY:

A. M. HYAMSON, O.B.E.

Vol. I. No. 3.	3rd Quarter.	5/6 Nett
----------------	--------------	----------

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. EDWARD M. WILSON	
THE POETRY OF JOAO PINTO DELGADO	131
2. CECIL ROTH	
JOSEPH DA FANO, THE FIRST ITALIAN JEWISH NOBLE	144
3. BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS	
THE DIVERGENCIES IN THE PRE-TIBERIAN MASSORETIC TEXT	147
4. J. L. TEICHER	
THE OLDEST DATED DOCUMENT IN THE GENIZAH ?	156
5. P. KLEIN	
RABBI SIMEON, THE AUTHOR OF MAIMONIDES' "TREATISE ON LOGIC"	158
6. D. WINTON THOMAS	
SURVEY OF CURRENT LITERATURE	159

THE POETRY OF JOÃO PINTO DELGADO

João Pinto Delgado was born of Portuguese New-Christian stock sometime after 1582. In 1616 he contributed a complimentary sonnet to a treatise for the enlightenment of the Jews by João Baptista de Este; this sonnet was almost certainly written to remove suspicion from his own unorthodoxy. Later he went to Rouen with his father; both men seem to have been important figures in the mercantile life of that city. In 1627 he published the collection of Spanish poems which is the subject of this article.¹ In 1632 João and his father were denounced to the city authorities as Judaizers. The poet fled to Paris and afterwards to Antwerp. The affair at Rouen was eventually settled by a large bribe paid to the authorities, and the father was able to return to Rouen. João, however, continued to dwell at Antwerp, and he obtained a certificate of his religious orthodoxy from a priest at Rouen. This document failed to satisfy official requirements at Antwerp, so further inquiries were made. Finally the Judge of the Ecclesiastical Court at Rouen reported that João Pinto Delgado denied the Trinity, studied Hebrew with two Rabbis, corresponded with the Jews of Venice, practised the ceremonies of the Law of Moses and proselytised among his fellow New Christians. We do not know what happened after this document was received; probably he escaped and settled in the Jewish community at Amsterdam—there is a reference to Mosseh Pinto Delgado author of the "Poëma de Hester" and the "Endechas santas de Jeremías" in the *Relación de los poetas* of Miguel de Barrios.²

The volume published in 1627 contains the following poems:

I. *Poema de la Reyna Ester*—a poem in nine cantos, of about two hundred lines each. The lines are hendecasyllabic, arranged in six-line stanzas which rhyme A-B-A-B-C-C.

II. *Lamentaciones del Propheta Ieremias*—a series of poetical meditations on the first two chapters of Lamentations; this work consists of 44 sections that correspond to the 44 verses of the two chapters, and a short introduction. There are in all 3,775 octosyllabic lines, arranged in *quintillas*, a five-line stanza in which the rhyme order varies.

III. *Historia de Rut Moabita*—648 octosyllabic lines in *redondillas*, a four-line stanza that rhymes a-b-b-a.

IV. *Canción, aplicando misericordias divinas, y defetos propios a la salida de Egipto asta la tierra santa*—111 lines of heptasyllables and hendecasyllables in 15-line stanzas, with a short final stanza of six lines.

V. *A la sabiduría*—112 lines of heptasyllables and hendecasyllables in eight-line stanzas.

VI. *Cántico a la salida de Egipto*—126 lines of heptasyllables and hendecasyllables in six-line stanzas. This poem is a paraphrase of Exodus XV.

¹ *Poema de la Reyna Ester, Lamentaciones del Propheta Ieremias, Historia de Rut, y varias Poesias* Por IOAN PINTO DELGADO. Al ilustrissimo y Reuerendissimo Cardenal de Richelieu . . . A Rouen. Chez Daudid du Petit Val, Imprimeur du Roy. MDCXXVII.

² For the details of the poet's life, see Mr. CECIL ROTH's "João Pinto Delgado—A Literary Disentanglement" in *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. xxx, 1935, pp. 19-25. For the full facts about the New Christians at Rouen and the documents about Pinto's activities there, see the same author's 'Les Marranes à Rouen' in the *Revue des Études Juives*, 1929, pp. 113-115. I wish to thank Mr. ROTH for sending me this article and for some helpful suggestions which he made when he saw an early version of this essay.

All these poems are religious in inspiration; four of them are directly derived from portions of the Old Testament. In his dedication to Cardinal Richelieu, Pinto Delgado refers to them as "these flowers of divine letters, the history of Queen Esther, the lamentations of the Prophet Jeremiah, and Ruth; their light always shines in the soul, although the humble veil of human words may conceal it." He is telling the Bible stories in his own words, but he realises that they cannot hope to convey all that the Bible can reveal to a pious reader. The "humble veil, which the world calls elegance (*adorno*)," is indeed "different from that simple and mysterious texture which, as it gradually comes to be understood, can never be entirely comprehended, because of the incapacity of our sight."³ Pinto means that he has tried to write poems on sacred subjects which shall satisfy the æsthetic criteria of his own day, but the words of Scripture have a supernatural origin, and hence a "mysterious texture," which a mere poet can never imitate. The elegant, human style is one thing; that of God another.

Pinto returns to the same topic in his preface to the reader. He says: "The holy text, which is full of so many mysteries that one must beware of not only a word but a letter too many, cannot be adapted to the human type of poetry, with which the world is pleased, without much care and difficulty."⁴ Whether he meant that the difficulty lay in preserving the profundities of the Biblical text in the "human" version, or in making Biblical language conform to the mode of his day, is uncertain. Perhaps, as a Jewish man of letters, he meant both. But the fundamental distinction that he made, that between the holy words of the source and those of his poetical paraphrases, must be considered by the critic. To twentieth-century readers, the style of the Bible seems to fulfil both human and divine requirements; why, then, should they bother to read a poem about Ruth or a paraphrase of Lamentations when they can read the excellent prose of the original Hebrew, the Authorised Version or the Vulgate? Only if the poet can give a new meaning to the original text; there is no virtue in an inferior paraphrase.

In the poems about Ruth and Esther, Pinto keeps to the Biblical narrative and sometimes follows it line by line. The division into nine cantos of the *Poema de la Reyna Ester* corresponds to the division into chapters of the Book of Esther, except that the three verses of chapter X are paraphrased at the end of the ninth canto instead of forming another of their own. The *Historia de Rut Moabita* is largely a verse by verse paraphrase of the Book of Ruth. Pinto does not start *in medias res* or make any significant alterations in the order of the original Hebrew text in the course of his poems. We cannot, then, expect to find an original plan in them; the planning had been done centuries before. Nor are his gifts as a narrator of the highest; occasionally it would be hard to follow his story if we had not his source to guide us. His preoccupation with the seventeenth-century notion of elegance sometimes makes him unduly euphemise his original; few modern readers would find his account of Ruth's refusal to leave Naomi as moving as the accounts of that incident in either the Hebrew, the Authorised Version or the Vulgate. These facts, together

³ I have had to paraphrase PINTO's words slightly. The original reads:

"... estas flores de las divinas letras, la historia de la Reyna Ester, las lamentaciones del Profeta Ieremías, y Rut, cuya luz siempre resplandece en el alma, aunque lo defienda el velo de la humildad de palabras humanas, que el mundo llama adorno, tan diferente de aquella simple, y misteriosa textura, la qual dexándose entender luego, nunca se dexa totalmente penetrar, por la incapacidad de nuestra vista." pp. á.v.—á.z.r. In this and in the later quotations from Pinto's writings, I have retained the original spelling and punctuation, but I have modernised his chaotic use of accents.

⁴ "Considera que no sin mucho cuidado, y dificultad se puede acomodar a la poesía humana, de que el mundo se agrada, el sagrado texto, que lleno de tantos misterios, se deve recelar no sólo una palabra, mas una letra demasiada." p. á.3.r.

with the lack of interest shown by modern Spanish readers in all long poems, may explain the neglect of Pinto's work in present-day Spain.

Pinto's descriptive style is superior to his narrative. In the *Ester*, there is a sumptuous description of Ahasuerus's feast, which owes a good deal to the manner of Góngora's *Soledades*. The description of the heroine's appearance and virtues in the same poem is also representative enough of the better kind of elegant writing of the Spanish seventeenth century.⁵ Haman's self-importance and arrogance are half-humorously portrayed later in the poem in a manner that recalls both Sir Epicure Mammon and Góngora's Polyphemus. When Ahasuerus finally turns on Haman because he supposes that the latter has violated his marital honour, we are reminded of the outraged and revengeful husbands of the Spanish golden-age theatre. These digressions and elaborations are well worth study for their own sakes; they also shew that in some ways Pinto Delgado was very much a poet of his own time.

The *Ester* also contains other digressions from the Biblical narrative which have a specifically religious interest. Pinto incorporated into his poem matter from the extra chapters of the Book of Esther which are not to be found in the Hebrew Bible, but which passed from the Septuagint to the Vulgate and the Apocrypha of the Authorised Version, and are also found in the Esther Midrash. The poet treated this material with much greater freedom than he used when he was dealing with the original Hebrew. Thus the dream of Mordecai is twice related in the Greek source: in the tenth, and again in the eleventh, chapters; Pinto used the latter account only, and left his readers to imply what the dream meant, though an interpretation was ready for him to use if he had wanted to. The prayers of Mordecai and of Esther (XIII. 9-18, and XIV. 1-19) probably gave Pinto the idea for similar passages in his poem; but in both these prayers he departed from the Septuagint and drew upon other portions of the Hebrew Scriptures for their composition. Also, he put the prayers in different places in his narrative from those they had occupied in his source (Vulgate or Midrash): in the poem Esther's prayer occurs between the first and second banquet, not before her first approach to Ahasuerus; Mordecai's dream is followed by a soliloquy which turns into a prayer in Pinto, whereas in the Septuagint the dream and the prayer are separated by the account of the conspiracy of Bigthan and Theresh and the copy of Ahasuerus's letter. These two prayers contain some of the best writing in the poem.

Pinto's greater respect for the Hebrew text than for the Septuagint is not surprising. Whether he had much knowledge of Hebrew is uncertain, but a scroll in that language was discovered when his house at Rouen was searched. On the other hand there are, as will be seen later, many traces of the Spanish Bible printed at Ferrara in 1553 in his poems. Mr. Roth has pointed out how quickly many specifically Jewish practices died out among the New Christians⁶; could Pinto have acquired sufficient Hebrew to read the Bible and the Talmud during the few years that intervened between his arrival in Rouen and the publication of his poems? Perhaps Pinto's linguistic ability and opportunities were exceptional; certainly there are coincidences between the *Poema de la Reyna Ester* and the *Tractate Megillah* that cannot be accidental. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this fact.

In the Book of Esther we are told that Ahasuerus consulted "the wise

⁵ When Pinto describes her eyes (p. 19), he mentions that they are often turned to Heaven in the holy exercise of ardent prayer. This reminiscence of the Christian paintings of his day is perhaps worth noting in a Jewish poet.

⁶ See particularly the seventh chapter of *A History of the Marranos*, Philadelphia, 1941, and the original account in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, xxii (1931), pp. 1-33.

men who knew the times " about what should be done with Vashti. Here are Pinto's lines :—

Sabios del tiempo en el dolor consulta.

A los cautiuos de Iudá refiere
(Ayrado el Rey) la traça de su intento,
Mas nadie el cargo, temeroso, adquiere;
Si tiempo breue muda el pensamiento ;
Y lo que un punto en premio se resuelve,
Otro en la pena, sin piedad se buelve.

Si el Rey (dizían) a morir condena
La Reyna, agora en el licor turbado,
Pacífico el furor, dará su pena
El injusto castigo al no culpado ;
Y si su afrenta, al fin, no restituye[,]
El dominio Imperial se diminuye.

(In the next stanza Ahasuerus's dilemma is stated, to which the Jews reply) :

Dizen. Quando, señor, nos fué contrario
El día, que en Sión el fuego vimos,
Assolado por tierra el Santuario,
Nuestra sciencia de jusgar perdimos ;
Moab y Amón, que nunca vió destierro,
Iusgue la causa de su pena y yerro. (pp.10-11)⁷

To the uninstructed reader the lines seem senseless ; why should Ahasuerus have consulted the very people whom he was afterwards so anxious to destroy ? The source of the whole passage is in the Talmud :—

And the king said to the wise men: Who are the wise men?—The Rabbis. Who knew the times: that is, who knew how to intercalate years and fix new moons. He said to them: Try her for me. They said (to themselves): What shall we do? If we tell him to put her to death, tomorrow he will become sober again and he will require her from us. Shall we tell him to let her go? She will lose all her respect for royalty. So they said to him: From the day when the Temple was destroyed and we were exiled from our land, counsel has been taken from us and we do not know how to judge capital cases. Go to Ammon and Moab who have remained in their places like wine that has settled on its lees. They spoke to him thus with good reason, since it is written, Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity. Therefore his taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed (*Jer. XLVIII. 11*).⁸

⁷ Ahasuerus in his grief consults wise men of the time. The angry King relates his intended project to the captives of Judah ; but through fear, no one undertakes the charge, if a short time causes their opinions to change ; and the matter which one argument decides favourably, another pitilessly turns back into a punishment.

They said : " If the King, now that he is dazed with wine, condemns the Queen to death, when his fury is quietened the unjust punishment will mete its penalty on the innocent ; and if (the punishment), finally, does not make good the insult to him, the rule of the Empire will be lessened . . . "

They say : " When, Sire, the day was adverse to us on which we saw the fire in Zion and the Sanctuary laid waste upon the earth, we lost our power of judgment. Let Ammon and Moab, who never saw exile, judge the cause of her punishment and sin. "

This and the other translations of the verse-extracts in this essay are intended to be as literal as possible in order to help those who do not know Spanish to follow my argument.

⁸ *The Babylonian Talmud Seder Mo'ed*, translated into English with notes, glossary and indices under the editorship of I. EPSTEIN. *Megillah*, translated into English with notes, glossary and indices by Maurice Simon, London, The Soncino Press. 1938. pp. 71-72 (12b). I am grateful to Mr. J. DAVIDSON for his permission to quote from various publications of the Soncino Press in this article.

The other parallel occurs when (VI. 13) Haman's wise men and his wife Zeresch told him: "If Mordecai be of the seed of the Jews, before whom thou hast begun to fall, thou shalt not prevail against him, but shalt surely fall before him." Here the Ferrara Bible reads:—

y dixerón a él sus sabios y Zeres su muger si de simiente de los Yudios Mordohay que començaste para caer delante él no podrás a él mas cayendo caerás delante él.⁹

Such is the literal reading: *cayendo caerás*—falling, thou shalt fall. Hence Pinto also chose to repeat the verb *caer* when he paraphrased the Biblical verse:—

Si de Iudá te procedió la guerra,
Iusto el dolor, y justo es el recelo,
Que quando caye, caye humilde a tierra,
Y quando sube, sube altivo al cielo;
Que al polvo iguala, iguala a las estrellas,
Postrado en él, o levantado en ellas. (p. 76)¹⁰

Here also ideas from the Talmud are used:—

But falling thou shalt fall. R. Judah b. Ila'i drew a lesson from this verse, saying: Why are two fallings mentioned here? Haman's friends said to him: This people is likened to the dust and it is likened to the stars. When they go down, they go down to the dust, and when they rise, they rise to the stars.

We cannot be certain that Pinto himself read the Talmud. But I have been unable to discover any Spanish version of either these or other passages that he may have drawn upon. Perhaps Salomón Usque's play *Esther*,¹² which I have not seen, will provide it; if not, Pinto must either have read the *Tractate Megillah* or have induced someone else to translate relevant passages for him.

The occurrence of such rabbinical passages in Pinto's poem gives them an antiquarian interest. The mere fact that he incorporated such material does not, of course, mean that he was therefore a great poet. The instances quoted above are curious, but only the second example shews any very great originality of expression, although the writing of the first is competent. More remarkable is the opening to the *Historia de Rut Moabita*, in which he made good use of Jewish ideas about the character of Elimelech.

The English translator of the Ruth Midrash¹³ tells us:—

One of the most interesting and original features of this Midrash is its portrayal of the characters of Elimelech, Ruth and Boaz. The clue to the apparently unmerited misfortunes and calamities which dogged the footsteps of Elimelech is found in his character. The famine, with the mention of which the book opens, was not a devastating one, but merely a scarcity which caused a rise in the price of commodities, and hardship to the poor. Elimelech was not one of these. On the contrary, he was one of the leading men of his generation (see Midrash I. 4. p. 21), an aspirant to the throne of Israel

⁹ Biblia En lengua Española traduzida palabra por palabra de la verdad Hebrayca por muy excelentes letrados vista y examinada por el officio de la Inquisicion. Con priuilegio del Yllustrissimo Señor Duque de Ferrara. (Ferrara. 1553.)

¹⁰ "If the war arose against thee from Judah, just is thy grief and just is thy fear; for when (Judah) falls, he falls humble to the ground, and when he rises, he rises overbearing to the heavens; for he is like the dust, he is like the stars, prostrated in the dust, or raised up to the stars."

¹¹ *Tractate Megillah*, ed. cit, p. 96 (16a).

¹² See Mr. CECIL ROTH's "*Salusque Lusitano (An Essay in Disentanglement)*", *The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series*, xxxiv (1943), p. 78. The play was written in 1558 (?) and was afterwards translated into Italian.

¹³ *Midrash Rabbah*, translated under the editorship of H. FREEDMAN, and MAURICE SIMON. *Ruth*, translated by L. RABINOWITZ, London, Soncino Press. 1939. p. vii.

(II. 5. p. 29), and his departure from Bethlehem was not on account of lack of means of subsistence, but a reprehensible flight from his responsibilities towards the poor who looked to him to provide for them in their distress (I. 4. p. 20). The punishment which came upon him was for this reason fully merited.

The poem begins :—

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) Al tiempo, que era Isráel
Por jüezes governado,
Siendo su daño el peccado,
Su llanto el refugio en él.</p> <p>(2) Después que passó el Iordán
Con segunda maravilla,
De nueve heredó su silla
Quien fué su nombre Abezán.</p> <p>(3) Faltando en el hombre el zelo,
Que alcanza el eterno fruto,
El campo negó el tributo,
Sus influencias el cielo.</p> <p>(4) Al centro le contradize
La espiga, en lo que señala,
Qual hombre, a quien no se iguala
La obra con lo que dize.</p> <p>(5) Es heno, que inculto, y vano
En el tejado creció,
Que el hombre, en lo que juntó
No pudo cargar su mano.</p> <p>(6) Falta el gusto, y sobra el daño,
Que quien el sustento olvida</p> | <p>Del alma, en su misma vida,
Lo niega a la vida el año.</p> <p>(7) La tierra, en su ingratitud,
Muestra el mal, el bien encierra,
Que mal produze la tierra,
Si muere en flor la virtud.</p> <p>(8) El verde honor, que en el prado
En oro el tiempo resuelve,
Piedras son, si en piedra buelve
Al corazón su peccado.</p> <p>(9) El labrador ve perder
Su esperansa, entre el espanto,
Y, pues no sembró con llanto,
Sembra [sic] su llanto al coger.</p> <p>(10) Varón de Iudá, que entiende
Del cielo la voluntad,
A los campos de Moab
Bolver sus años pretende.</p> <p>(11) De Betlén descansa allí
Elimelec, a quien son
Sus hijos Maalón, Chilón,
Y su consorte Naomi.</p> |
|---|---|

(pp. 317—319)¹⁴

The passage begins with the paraphrase of the first words of Ruth :—

Y fué en días de juzgar los jüezes y fué fambre en la tierra . . .

¹⁴ At the time when Israel was governed by judges, when sin was its hurt and tears its refuge in sin ;
after (Israel) crossed the Jordan by a second miracle, he whose name was Ibzan inherited its (judgment-) seat from nine.

As the zeal that obtains the eternal fruit was lacking in man, the field denied (him) its tribute, Heaven (denied him) its influences.

The ear of corn, in what it shews forth, conceals (*lit.* contradicts) its heart (*i.e.* its inner rottenness), like a man whose deeds do not conform to his words ;
it (? and he) is grass that, wild and valueless, grew on the house-top, for the man (*i.e.* the reaper) could not fill (*lit.* load) his hand with what he gathered of it.

Pleasure fails, hurts become too great ; for the year denies to the life of the man who forgets the food of his soul, the food of his life itself.

The earth in its (? and his) ingratitude shews forth the bad and conceals the good, for the earth gives a bad yield if virtue dies in flower.

The green pride, which Time turns into gold in the field, is (turned into) stones, if his sin turns (man's) heart into stone.

The farmer sees his hope lost amidst the horror, and, as he did not sow with weeping, he sows his weeping when he reaps.

A man of Judah, who understands the will of Heaven, seeks to divert his life to the fields of Moab ;

there rests Elimelech of Bethlehem, whose sons were Mahlon and Chilion and whose wife was Naomi.

As the second chapter of Judges relates how Israel "went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them" in the days when the judges judged, Pinto introduced the idea of sin, punishment and repentance which he developed in the following stanzas. After a reminder of God's mercy to His people in the crossings of the Red Sea and the Jordan, the scene is set in the days of Ibzan; the poet here follows a Jewish tradition, for this is the time assigned to the story in the Ruth Midrash (III. 6. p. 47). The third quatrain mentions both sin and punishment; earthly fruits were denied when man neglected to earn spiritual fruits. (The poems of the Midrash tell us that the famine was a punishment, either because the Jews showed negligence at the funeral of Joshua, or because of their sloth and that of their prophets, or because of their rebelliousness and pride.) As we read on, we see that there is a special appropriateness between the punishment of famine and the sin of hypocrisy; a man who is only pious in word is like the bad corn that deceives the sight with its empty husk. The same thought is then repeated in a series of biblical metaphors. Taken literally, the fifth quatrain means that the ears of corn, the *espigas* of the preceding lines, are as worthless as the grass upon the housetops from which the farmer can never obtain a full load; but the lines can also be read to mean that the hypocrite himself is like the grass. In any case the *espiga* is identified with the *hombre* as well as with the *heno*. The figure of grass upon the housetops occurs several times in the Bible. In Psalm cxxix. 6:—

Let them (the wicked) be as the grass upon the housetops, which withereth afore it groweth up:

Wherewith the mower filleth not his hand; nor he that bindeth sheaves his bosom.

and in Isaiah xxxvii. 27:—

Therefore their inhabitants (of the fenced cities) were of small power, they were dismayed and confounded; they were as the grass of the field, and as the green herb, as the grass on the housetops, and as corn blasted before it be grown up.

Pinto used both passages. The first is obviously the source of the last two lines of the quatrain, but the verse of Isaiah identifies the corn with the grass upon the housetops, because both represent the fate of the inhabitants of the Assyrian walled cities. By setting down the two Biblical texts side by side, it is apparent that the poet used them both, and by their means was able to devise an ambiguous metaphor (*heno—espiga*, *heno—hombre*) that clinched his meaning. Ambiguity has been deliberately used to produce an admirable concentration of expression. The apparently obscure repetition of the word *hombre* also is effective: the first man is the hypocrite, the second the man who reaps the fruits of hypocrisy, that is—the same hypocrite. The next lines are intricate in expression. If a man forgets his soul's food in his spiritual life, the year—the seasons, nature—will deny nourishment to his earthly life—his body. In the seventh quatrain there is another ambiguity, again, I am sure, deliberate. The fruits of the earth do not mature if the flower dies; the man who only talks of virtue but does not act, produces flowers but not fruit. God has so arranged life that famine is the reward of the spiritually unfruitful man. Hence the barren crops are both a metaphor of the man who is barren of good deeds, and literally, his punishment. The ambiguity lies in the word *su* (his, its) of the first line of this quatrain; *su* applies both to the earth, which is ungrateful to man, and to man, who is ungrateful to God. The next lines stress what has previously been said. The stony-hearted man finds his food turned to stones. The expression here is more direct; there is a strong contrast between the evocative image of the green honour of the

fields that turns to gold in the first two lines, and the *piedras son* in the third. In the ninth quatrain the interest shifts from the ruined crop to the farmer who is responsible for it. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy" (Psalm cxxvi. 5); "He that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity" (Proverbs xxii. 8). Pinto has combined these two verses by twisting the wording of the first into the meaning of the second. The *labrador* is the unjust man who, if he does not actually sow iniquity, does not do his duty. Who is he? the answer is Elimelech. The long parenthesis which explains the cause of the famine is rounded off by the return to the paraphrase of the verse with which the poem started:—

... y fué fambre en la tierra; y anduvo varón de Bethlehem de Yehudah por peregrinar en campos de Moab él y su muger y dos sus hijos. Y nombre del varón Elimelech y nombre de su muger Nahomí (hermosa) y nombre de sus hijos Mahalón y Chilón Ephratéas de Bethlehem de Yehudah...

The whole of this digression is idle, extraneous to the poem, unless we take Elimelech as one whose guilt was punished by the famine and symbolised by the rotten corn. We are told that he understood the decrees of Heaven; significantly, we are not told that he fulfilled them. The Midrash tells us that he:

was one of the notables of his place and one of the leaders of his generation. But when the famine came, he said, "Now all Israel will come knocking at my door (for help), each one with his basket." He therefore arose and fled from them. (I. 4. p. 21.)

He knew that he ought to be charitable, but he avoided his obligation.

In these lines Pinto has deliberately used ambiguity and repetition to emphasise his meaning. The repetitions are emphatic: *hombre—hombre—hombre, olvida—vida—vida, tierra—mal—mal—tierra, piedras—piedra, sembró—sembra*. And in the tenth quatrain he used another device—as far as I know, his own invention—to emphasise the sin of Elimelech. The attentive reader will have noticed that in this quatrain *Moab* and *voluntad* are not true rhymes, whereas the other rhymes are regular enough.¹⁵ This apparent carelessness is as deliberate as the repetition; in the preface *Al lector* Pinto says that he made the faulty rhyme purposely to shew the error of Elimelech: "because he left the worship of God to go to the lands of the Gentiles, not through poverty, but for the opposite reason, as can be seen."¹⁶ Elimelech's sin is echoed by the imperfect rhyme, but we cannot see that his emigration was sinful unless we take the whole parenthesis to refer specifically to him.

In these lines Pinto has not merely versified a traditional interpretation; he uses the material poetically. The reader is made to feel the fruitlessness of hypocrisy. Pinto started his poem by paraphrasing the first part of the first verse of Ruth, but, before he could complete it, he digressed, using other parts of the Scriptures to emphasise that man is responsible for his actions, and that he will suffer if he neglects what he knows to be his duty. The tone of the writing is earnest and solemn; it is supported by the metaphors of Scripture and emphasised by conceits in the seventeenth-century serious style. When we have read this passage, we see that it is only apparently a digression, because it is made an essential preliminary to what happens later: as Elimelech went out in sin, so was Ruth to return in virtue. Pinto took the Rabbinic view of Elimelech's actions and expressed it so cogently that all can feel its

¹⁵ The rhyme words *Moab* and *piedad* occur in the author's *Lamentaciones del Profeta Ieremías*, p. 146. The passage refers to the sins of Israel during the time of the Judges.

¹⁶ En lo que consiente, se siguieron las metáforas propias, y necesarias, y contraposiciones; como... en la historia de Rut copla 10. Errado el consonante de voluntad, y Moab, en mostrarse el yerro de Elimelec por salir del culto divino a las tierras de la gentilidad, no por pobreza, mas a lo contrario, como se ve. (ã.3.r.)

moral importance. His real purpose is to shew how spiritual neglect affects worldly prosperity—"where there is no vision the people perish"—and his success is due to the concentration of an old tradition of biblical interpretation in a newer method of poetic expression. The rest of the poem has less merit than this opening; here, however, the poet has made a valid poetic statement, acceptable to those who might otherwise reject the teachings of the Midrash.

Menéndez y Pelayo considered that Pinto Delgado's finest work was his paraphrase of the Lamentations of Jeremiah. "In all the seventeenth century, there can hardly be found better *quintillas*; certainly there are none so simple, so inspired or so rich in feeling."¹⁷ Menéndez y Pelayo's taste in poetry was nearly always sound, except when he wrote about Góngora and those influenced by him; here the praise may be qualified—Pinto's verse is not always simple—but the judgment of the outstanding merits of the meditations on Lamentations cannot be wholly set aside.

As has already been mentioned above, this poem is divided into 44 sections, each of which is based on the corresponding verse of the first two chapters of Lamentations. The prose translation of each verse from the Hebrew forms the heading to each meditation. In every case the translation is a modification of the Ferrara version, a modification that at times clearly reveals the influence also of the Protestant Bible (the Bear Bible) of Cassiodoro de Reyna.¹⁸ Rather than quote from many different sections of the poem, I have, with some diffidence, chosen the meditation on I. 18 to illustrate his method of composition. Here is the prose translation of that verse:

Justo es el Señor porque su dicho rebellé: oyd agora todos los pueblos.
y ved mi dolor (:) mis vírgines y mis mancebos anduvieron en cautiverio,
(p. 194.)

Here Pinto has hardly modified the Ferrara version; even the archaic form *rebellé* has been preserved, although the abbreviation .A. for the Divine Name has been replaced by *el Señor* and the spelling has been brought up to date.¹⁹ The verse is then paraphrased as follows:—

- | | |
|--|--|
| (1) La justicia es mi castigo,
Mi culpa quien mereció
La afrenta de mi enemigo,
El cielo en ella el testigo,
Y quien la padece yo. | (4) El animal furioso
Conoce, por varios modos,
Quien fué, a su vida piedoso,
Mas yo, más cruel, que todos,
Negué mi propio reposo. |
| (2) Pues antes que diesse el día
Al Oriente el resplandor,
Por sus Prophetas oía
Aquella voz del Señor,
De que, ignorante, reía. | (5) El buey conoce el lugar,
Y su pesebre no olvida,
Mas yo por considerar
Quien era mi propia vida,
Mi vida quise olvidar. |
| (3) Con ansia de ver, que estava,
Qual mármol mi corazón,
A lo que, amante, traçava,
Tal vez mostrava pasión,
Tal vez della se olvidava. | (6) El lirio del campo e sido,
Y de los valles la rosa,
Delicias de mi querido,
Diziendo. Viene mi hermosa,
Que por buscarte é venido. |

¹⁷ "Nunca se elevó a más altura Moseh Pinto Delgado; nunca hizo tan gallarda muestra de su fluidez métrica y de la viva penetración que tenía de las cosas bellas, como en su paráfrasis de los *Trenos de Jeremías*, que es la mejor corona de su memoria. Apenas hay mejores *quintillas* en todo el siglo XVII, y de fijo ningunas tan sencillas, inspiradas y ricas de sentimiento." *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*. V. ii. (p. 340 of the fifth volume of the edition published in Buenos Aires, 1945.)

¹⁸ I hope to illustrate this borrowing by Pinto in another place.

¹⁹ Here is the literal transcript of Lamentations I. 18. in the version of Ferrara: Justo es .A. por que su dicho rebellee: oyd agora todos los pueblos y veed mi dolor: mis vírgines y mis mancebos anduvieron en captiverio.

- (7) *Passado el invierno duro*
Dexó la tierra el nublado,
Y en él, amante, procuro
Que el sol, con rayo dorado,
Renueve tiempo seguro.
- (8) *La tierra brota sus flores,*
Que en la suavidad conbidan
A refirir mis amores,
Con canto los ruyseñores,
Que entre los ramos se anidan.
- (9) *Yo, que obligada debía*
Seguir de su voluntad
La gloria, que me ofrecía,
Seguí, tras mi vanidad,
Errores de mi porfía.
- (10) *No buela, con tanto estruendo,*
La flecha, que las estrellas
Parece que va siguiendo,
Como a sus voces huyendo,
Tratava apartarme dellas.
- (11) *O pueblos, que no entendéis*
Qual fué mi propio rigor,
En este extremo, que veis,
Yo ruego que me escuchéis
Las causas de mi dolor.
- (12) *Pues fué mi desobediencia*
De mi maldad el indicio,
Quiso la eterna clemencia
Ejecutar, en su ausencia,
El golpe en mi sacrificio.
- (13) *Mis donzellas regaladas,*
En poder de dueño injusto,
Cautivas van, y afrentadas,
Sin ser del cielo, aunque justo,
Sus lágrimas escuchadas.
- (14) *Quando rebienta su quexa*
Del desmayado respiro,
Tanto el alivio se alexa,
Que en la mitad del suspiro
El alma, huyendo, la dexa.
- (15) *Los mancebos, que en valor*
Mostravan pechos altivos
Humilla un duro señor,
Atados, como cautivos,
Por manos de su ofensor.
- (16) *Señor, si desta prisión*
Fué instrumento el peccado,
Les sirva, para perdón,
La memoria de otro atado,
Que alcansó tu bendición.

(pp. 194—198)²⁰

²⁰ Justice is my punishment, my guilt that which merited the outrage of my enemy ; Heaven is the witness of it, and I (Jerusalem) she who suffers it.

For before the day gave its brightness to the East, I used to hear the voice of the Lord through his prophets, at which I laughed in my ignorance.

In His agony, when He saw that my heart was like marble to what He, as a lover, intended, He sometimes revealed His suffering and sometimes forgot it.

The wild beast knows in various ways who has been merciful to its life, but I, more cruel than all (the beasts), denied my own repose.

The ox knows its stable (*lit.* place) and does not forget its manger, but I, because I considered my own life, chose to forget my (true) life (*i.e.* God).

I was the lily of the field and the rose of the valleys, the delight of my Beloved. He said to me : " Come, my fair one, for I have come to seek thee.

" The hard winter is past, the storm-cloud has left the earth, and in the cloud I, your lover, make the sun with its golden beams renew the certain (promise of fair) weather.

" Earth puts forth its flowers that gently invite the nightingales who nest in the branches to tell My loves with their singing."

I, who should have gratefully followed the glory of His will, which He offered to me, followed (instead) the errors of my obstinacy, after my vanity.

The arrow that seems to pursue the stars does not fly with such speed as I shewed when I fled from His words and tried to separate myself from them.

O all people ! you who do not know how great was my own hardness (of heart), in this extremity that you behold, I beg you to listen to the causes of my grief.

Because my disobedience was the sign of my iniquity, the everlasting Mercy chose to strike the blow upon my sacrifice by His absence.

My delicate maidens go captive and outraged in the power of an unjust master, their tears are unheard by Heaven, despite (Heaven's) justice.

When their (words of) complaint burst from their fainting sigh, help so far departs from them that their souls, in their flight, leave them in the midst of the sigh.

A hard lord humbles the young men who shewed proud hearts in (their) bravery ; (the young men) bound like captives by the hands of their oppressor.

Lord, if my sin was the instrument of this captivity, let the memory of another man who was bound (but) who obtained Thy blessing, enable them (to have) Thy pardon.

The paraphrase follows the three sections into which the original verse is divided. "The Lord is righteous" (*La justicia es mi castigo*); "for I have rebelled against his commandment" (*Seguí, tras mi vanidad, Errores de mi porfía*): "hear, I pray you, all people (*O pueblos, que no entendéis*)" "and behold my sorrow" (*Yo ruego que me escuchéis/Las causas de mi dolor*): "my virgins" (*Mis vírgines regaladas*) "and my young men" (*Los mancebos*) "are gone into captivity" (*cautivas van . . . como cautivos*). Although Pinto carefully follows the triple construction of the Biblical verse, his lines do not fall into three separate parts; the stanzas are a sequence, and each of them carefully leads to its successor.

The justice of the punishment of Jerusalem means that her sin was heinous; it consisted in laughing at the word of God as revealed by His prophets, and in hardening her heart when He shewed His love for her. Even wild animals remember their benefactors, and

The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. (Isaiah I. 3.)

Then follows an evocation of the time when Israel enjoyed the love of God, poetically expressed in the imagery of the Song of Solomon:—

I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys . . .

My beloved spake, and said unto me, Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.

For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone;

The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land. (II. I, 10-11.)

Two stanzas then stress the enormity of her sins: vanity and the deliberate flight from God. The other nations are called upon to witness the punishment: the captivity of the maidens and the young men. Finally the poet rounds off the whole passage by pleading the example of the sacrifice of Isaac who obtained God's blessing.

In the *Lamentaciones del Profeta Ieremías*, Pinto avoided the error that he committed in both the *Rut Moabita* and in the *Reyna Ester*. Here he was no longer following a narrative verse by verse; the meditative manner allowed him to select and to reject. In this poem, each verse of Lamentations allowed him to pick his material from any other part of the Old Testament that suited his purpose. Even the euphemisms are pardonable in these stanzas, for the comparison with the original does not at once leap to the reader's mind, because he does not know what allusions will follow next. Pinto is writing poetry and using the Bible to help him; in the other two poems we sometimes feel that his main endeavour is to accommodate Scripture to mundane ears. In the extract just quoted most of the imagery can be traced to a Biblical source—I have only noted the most obvious allusions—but he has combined these allusions in an original manner or modified them to produce a special effect. At the same time he does not lose sight of the verse of Jeremiah on which he is meditating. Here there is no conflict between the man of letters and the Biblical expounder.

It was a matter of some difficulty to choose the right extract from the *Lamentaciones* to illustrate this article. Many of the other sections of the poem are as good. I chose this one because of its variety of feeling in a relatively small compass. There is a fine contrast between the deliberately low-pitched tone of the opening stanzas and the lyricism of those in which the poet quotes from the Song of Solomon, which are then followed by lines of a Calderonian terseness:

Seguí, tras mi vanidad,
Errores de mi porfía.

The simile of the arrow is vivid, and the invocation of the peoples is rhetorically effective. The grief of the virgins is described in one of the less happy stanzas (*Quando rebienta su quexa . . .*), but similar faults of taste can be found in many good seventeenth-century poems. The last stanza comes as a complete surprise—there is nothing in the Scriptural verse to make the reader expect it—and the moving and simple expression of redemption through suffering makes a magnificent ending to the section.

In this article I have tried to shew that Pinto Delgado's poetry is more than an antiquarian curiosity. I have also noted features of a peculiarly Jewish kind that deserve the investigation and exploration of a serious student of Rabbinics.²¹ A few instances have been quoted to show that Pinto was a man of his time who was acquainted with the work of other Spanish poets. The *Poema de la Reyna Ester* shews that he had read Góngora and learned from him; there are reminiscences of Jorge Manrique in the *Lamentaciones*. Various topics of post-Renaissance poetry are mentioned from time to time in his pages: the peacock with spreading tail and ugly feet (p. 155), the bird that finds that its nest has been robbed (p. 266), the Italian tag so often quoted by Cervantes: *Per troppo variar natura è bella* (p. 23) and so forth. Pinto certainly had a fair knowledge of what other Spanish poets had already written; it is not easy to say just how much he owed to them.

In one way he cut himself off completely from the practice of his contemporaries. There are no mythological references in his writings, even when an unbeliever like Haman is speaking. Probably Pinto regarded all ornamental references to false gods as idolatrous. This fact, however, does not mean that he did not learn from others who used mythology in their works. Since the days of Santob de Carrión, little self-consciously Jewish poetry had been written in the peninsula; Pinto had therefore to form his style on Christian models. We can naturally suppose that he had read Garcilaso, Góngora and Camões; we cannot be sure that he knew anything about St. John of the Cross or Fray Luis de León. Of his contemporaries he may well have read Lope de Vega and Quevedo, in whose works he would have come across religious or ascetic poetry that was not unlike some of his own. Quevedo also wrote a poetic paraphrase on the first chapter of Lamentations, and in this, too, each section is prefaced by a supposedly literal prose translation from the Hebrew. This work was composed before 1613, but never saw print until the nineteenth century; it is not impossible that Pinto saw a manuscript version. In the works of both Lope and Quevedo, to say nothing of many minor writers, he may have found other treatments of his own favourite themes: sin, punishment, penance, forgiveness. There is a large body of this penitential poetry in Spanish (some of it is of considerable merit), which dates from the mid-sixteenth century onwards; probably Pinto found in it a subject and a style to emulate.

After the extraordinary richness of the Spanish poetry of the first twenty years of the seventeenth century, there is a hardly less remarkable decline. Much was written, but little of value has survived. Clever imitations of Góngora, cruder pastiches of Quevedo's burlesques, occasional verses on frivolous subjects, burlesques of the Metamorphoses—such are the usual contents of the poetry-books of the third and fourth decades of the century. Pinto Delgado is not so great a poet as some of his Spanish predecessors, but his works are superior to those of some of his contemporaries who have been reprinted recently. He is certainly superior to the other Marrano poets of his

²¹ Mr. A. D. H. FISHLÖCK tells me that he has recently come across a possible Latin source for Pinto's allusions to Rabbinical writings on the Book of Esther.

century, in spite of occasional crabbednesses and awkward constructions. Enriquez Gómez and Barrios are facile and diffuse ; Pinto is more concentrated as well as more serious. Perhaps it is sometimes good for a poet to be separated from his own country ; he may, if his style is formed, develop his talents more profitably when he is isolated from frivolous contemporary fashions. The occasional awkwardness of construction is probably attributable to his writing in a foreign language in another foreign country. Also, he did not write merely to shew off his own skill ; he wrote to exemplify, to make clear religious truths. This aim has its dangers too ; Pinto avoided them in his best work. The *Ester* and the *Rut* are sometimes prosy, or too literal, or too much euphemised, but the opening of *Rut* and most of the *Lamentaciones* have not these characteristics. The two shorter original poems are also notable.

Pinto's work will doubtless interest Jewish readers because of the Rabbinic allusions that it contains. It may well appear curious, for this reason, to Christians also. The merit of the poetry, however, lies in the way that Jewish attitudes are expressed, not merely in the fact that they are expressed. He used Jewish ideas in much the same way that other Spanish poets used Catholic ideas. Fray Luis de León's Ode to the Ascension can be apprehended by any reader of any religious faith ; those who are not Jews may similarly be moved by Pinto's description of the sorrows of Zion.²² Luis de León and Pinto could not have written as they did, had the one not been a Christian, the other a Jew ; but each is able to use his religious associations in such a way that they make their readers feel general human truths in their religious statements, even if the poets wrote originally for readers of their own faiths. The world's greatest religious poetry was written by men of strongly defined religious beliefs, but it is accessible to others who do not share those beliefs. A Christian can accept Pinto's Elimelech without believing that the original Elimelech left the Holy Land to avoid giving away food to the poor.

I have already mentioned my belief that Pinto was influenced by the poetry of the Spanish Counter-Reformation. His expressions of contrition and disillusion have Christian parallels. Many of his technical devices are those used by Spanish poets who wrote a short time before his book was published. Although his work never influenced later Spanish writers, it arises from the main body of Spanish poetry and should be considered along with that poetry.²³

London.

EDWARD M. WILSON.

²² I do not mean to imply from this comparison that Pinto Delgado's poems are as good as Fray Luis de León's.

²³ I must thank Professor IG. GONZÁLEZ LLUBERA for his care and trouble in reading through this essay and suggesting some improvements in it.

JOSEPH DA FANO, THE FIRST ITALIAN JEWISH NOBLE

In his "Humble Addresses" to Oliver Cromwell, composed at the time of the readmission of the Jews to England, Menasseh ben Israel refers, by way of evidence to the loyalty and utility of the Jews, to "the Lord Joseph da Fano, Marquis of Villependi, [who] was a man much respected of all the Princes in Italy, and was called by them, The Peace-maker and appeaser of all troubles; because he, by his authority and entremise, was used to appease all troubles and strife rising amongst them."¹ These details (together with the entire passage, which is of considerable historical importance) are copied from a hortatory letter written to some fellow-Marranos by Immanuel Aboab (author of the famous history of tradition, *Nomologia*), inviting them to embrace Judaism; for, though published for the first time by the present writer only a few years ago, this important text was obviously widely known in the Amsterdam community. Aboab's statement, written in Spanish between 1619 and 1628, is almost literally identical: "Similarly, we knew in Italy the Lord Joseph da Fano, Marquis of Vellimpendi, honoured and esteemed by all the princes of that land, and known as the peace and sustainer of all its disquiets; for this was his occupation, to accommodate so far as he could the differences between the various Lords and to intervene in business of gravity."² The Spanish poetaster of Amsterdam, Miguel de Barrios, also refers summarily to Joseph da Fano, Marquis of Villependi, as one of the ornaments of the Jewish people, plainly basing himself either on the "Humble Addresses" or Aboab's letter.³ Neither Kayserling nor Wolf in their editions of the former work were able to give any further details regarding this enigmatical Jewish noble; and in publishing Aboab's letters I appended the naïve note: "No mention of Joseph da Fano is to be found in the current histories."

By degrees, however, his personality has begun to become clearer. There is a fleeting reference to him in the continuation of Joseph ha-Cohen's, *Emek ha-Bakha*, which indicates at least the date and place of his activity:

"In the year 5347 [14th August, 1587] Duke Guglielmo of Mantua closed his days, and his son Vincenzo Gonzaga [I: 1587-1612] ruled in his place. He shewed the Jews mercy and spoke good things to their heart: and the Lord⁴ Joseph of Fano was of those who saw the King's face, and he concluded a covenant with them and sealed it with the King's seal. He also concluded a covenant with the men of Monferrato with good laws wherein they might live."⁵

It is not quite clear whether we are to understand that it was Joseph da Fano who was the intermediary for the conclusion of the arrangements referred to in the text. We have, however, the details of the new constitution for the

¹ To his Highness the Lord Protector . . . the Humble Addresses of Menasseh ben Israel. Amsterdam? 1655, p. 7.

² J.Q.R. N.S. xxiii. p. 139, 154.

³ *Historia Universal Judayca*, c. 6. From the similarity of spelling, it is to be imagined that he derived his information rather from Menasseh.

⁴ השר

⁵ ED. EETTERIS, p. 176.

Jewish community of Mantua concluded after long negotiation with the Duke on March 25th, 1588¹ and of the fresh *condotta* for these of Monferrato (now under the rule of the Gonzaga) issued in the same year, repeating verbally, however, the terms of that of 1576,² neither of which mention him.

The relations between Mantua and Ferrara were intimate; and it may be that Joseph da Fano was the son of one of the most prominent Jews in the latter place—Isaac da Fano, extolled in his *Me'or 'Enayim* by Azariah de' Rossi (who knew his library) as "the liberal" and "the noble and greatly praised." He was one of the presiding officers of the Ferrara community at the time of the terrible earthquake of 1570, and with his colleague Don Isaac Abrabanel II came to the help of the sufferers. Two elegies written on his death have been preserved.³ The former family synagogue in Ferrara, still known as the Scuola Fano, was the only one in the city not ruined entirely by the Fascist mobs during the recent war.

As regards Joseph da Fano's political work, evidence is now forthcoming from which it is possible to see that Aboab's account has a basis in fact. There has been published a tantalisingly short passage of a letter written apparently on March 19th, 1614, by a certain Jew named Ippolito da Fano, who can hardly be other than our Joseph—an intimate of Duke Ferdinando of Mantua (1612-1626) and in his name. The recipient was Cesare d'Este, Duke of Modena, with whom also he was as it would appear on familiar terms. The latter was informed of the pleasure that the Gonzaga had felt on hearing of the birth of a child to the d'Este family, and how "after dinner, when His Highness withdrew to stroll with me for a good time, we spoke about nothing else."⁴ Were detailed research possible in the Mantuan archives, probably a good deal more material would be found.

Some time apparently before 1628, when (at the latest) Aboab wrote, Joseph da Fano was raised to the nobility, as Marquis of Villimpenta (it is thus that the place-name should be read) in the Duchy of Mantua. Presumably this was done at the request of the Duke, by the Holy Roman Emperor, who alone exercised such powers in north Italy. In 1622, Jacob Bassevi "von Treuenberg" of Prague was raised to the nobility, being hitherto considered the earliest Jew to have been so honoured. Da Fano must have pressed him close, or even preceded him, the dignity which he now enjoyed being in any case a higher one. He is certainly the first Jew to have been ennobled in Italy.⁵

Among the Italian Jews of the period, Joseph da Fano seems to have been regarded with profound veneration. He is referred to as "the Prince" (השר) or "the exalted" (הנשא הקצין הנשגב). When, in 1587, Dr. David de Pomis produced his famous Hebrew-Italian dictionary, *Zemah David*, he not only sent Da Fano a complimentary copy, but inserted in it a eulogistic poem written

¹ COLORNI, *Le magistrature maggiori della comunità ebraica di Mantova* (off-print from *Rivista di storia del diritto italiano*, 1938) p. 21. There is no mention of Da Fano in the same writer's extremely useful study, *Fatti e figure di storia ebraica mantovana*, in *Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, ix (1934), 217-239.

² S. FOÀ, *Gli Ebrei nel Monferrato*, Alessandria, 1914, p. 169.

³ S. BERNSTEIN, *Mishshir Israel be'Italia*, Jerusalem, 1939, §§ 87, 88: *Meor 'Enayim*, chapters xxiii, xlvii.

⁴ BALLETTI, *Gli Ebrei e gli Estensi*, 2nd ed., Reggio, 1930, p. 164.

⁵ It is hardly surprising that the name does not figure in the list of the ennobled Italian Jewish families appended to *I cognomi degli Ebrei d'Italia* by S. SCHAERF, Florence, 1925, and similar works, according to which the first Italian Jew to achieve this dignity was Baron Joseph Treves de' Bonfilii, of Venice, created a Baron by Napoleon in 1812.

for him by no less a person than Leone da Modena. In this, the courtier is referred to in mellifluous phrases as being "great in the midst of his people, beloved by all, and great among the princes . . . important, beloved and near to the government," and the poet went on to say that all Israel would pray for his well-being and length of days.¹ It was to Modena, too, that recourse was later on made for an elegy in memory of Hannah, Joseph's wife.² Among his correspondence there is preserved in addition a letter (presumably of 1597), probably written on the account of one of the leading persons of the community of Venice, in which the "prince and great one in Israel" was begged in terms of the utmost urgency to exert his influence in order to end the dispute that had arisen between two prominent Jews.³ Abraham Jaghel, of Monselice (to whose *'Orah Hayyim* he contributed a commendatory poem), dedicated to him (perhaps in 1592), the first edition of his once-famous catechism, *Leqah Tob*, calling him "the ornament of the age," and suggesting that thereby it might find a place on "the royal table."

When Joseph da Fano died cannot be ascertained; there is no real evidence that the poem in honour of a distinguished person named Joseph, published by Dr. S. Bernstein, really refers to him, though it may be so.⁴ In the course of the seventeenth century, various members of the Fano family—Solomon, Abraham Vita and Joseph Nissim—farmed important State monopolies in Mantua,⁵ and obviously were persons of some significance in public affairs; but it is impossible to prove whether they or the other eminent persons of the same name encountered elsewhere⁶ had any association with the important figure who is now slowly beginning to emerge to light—the Lord Joseph (Ippolito) da Fano (c. 1550—c. 1630), Marquis of Villimpenta, the first Italian (and perhaps the first European) Jew raised to the nobility.

C. ROTH.

¹ *Divan of Leone da Modena*, ed. BERNSTEIN, § xlvi, pp. 89-90.

² *Ibid.*, § ccxiv, pp. 220-1.

³ *Briefe und Schrifftstücke*, ed. L. BLAU, § v., pp. 4-5.

⁴ S. BERNSTEIN, *op. cit.*, § lii.

⁵ FoA, *op. cit.*, o. 34 n.

⁶ E.g. the Jacob Fano executed at Mantua for sorcery in 1600, or his homonym, author of the poetical work *Shilte ha-Gibborim*. Isaac da Fano is indeed stated by DE' ROSSI in the prefatory section of his *Me'or 'Enayim* to have been related to Isaac Berechiah da Fano I., and thus to the Cabbalist Menahem Azariah da Fano.

THE DIVERGENCIES IN THE PRE-TIBERIAN MASSORETIC TEXT*

In his well-known off-print, *On the present state of proto-Septuagint studies*,¹ Professor H. M. Orlinsky not only argued strongly for the Lagarde-Margolis approach to the reconstruction of the original text of the LXX, but also attacked the recent views of the Massoretic textual transmission as expounded by Kahle and Sperber. Professor H. H. Rowley, in a discussion of Orlinsky *versus* Alexander Sperber on the proto-LXX question, came to the conclusion that Orlinsky had put forward the stronger case²; it is one of the purposes of this paper to consider whether Orlinsky is equally successful in his treatment of the Massoretic Text. Naturally he devotes much less space to the argument about the M.T. than he does to the LXX, but he claims that what he says is representative of "the view which is held by practically all competent scholars to-day," viz., "that all preserved manuscripts of the Hebrew text of the O.T. go back to the one recension, which came to dominate in the first-second century A.D. at the latest."³

Before proceeding, it is fair to state, against Orlinsky, that among prominent modern scholars who have definitely declared themselves opposed to this view are C. Steuernagel, O. Eissfeldt, J. Hempel, A. Bentzen among continental scholars, Wheeler Robinson in this country, R. H. Pfeiffer in the U.S.A., in addition, of course, to the Kahle school, with Sperber in the U.S.A. Even C. D. Ginsburg at the beginning of the present century was not wholly given to the Lagardean view, and H. L. Strack and E. König in the 19th century were definitely opposed to it.

Orlinsky allows that the LXX does represent, in various books, text-forms which differ recensionally from the Massoretic text-tradition, but states that "those text-traditions have long perished, driven out by the Hebrew text that was used by the Mishnah and Talmud, by Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus, Origen, Jerome."⁴ The key-words here are that these versions represent one recension only of the Hebrew text, which was authoritative; and that the archetype was scrupulously copied and transmitted by the Massoretes. But it is just here that Orlinsky's case appears to be weakest. As yet, there is no first-hand evidence of the existence of an archetype, and any appeal to circumstantial evidence must be admitted to be unsatisfactory. Because the argument for the existence of the archetype is mainly based on these Greek and Latin renderings and versions, the onus lies on its advocates to show that an identical archetype was the parent text in each of these versions; and an examination of each would, I think, result in a verdict of *non-possumus*. Even a superficial glance shows this adequately. Jerome is not a strong support for the hypothesis, because, not only is there the unfortunate text-history of the Vulgate, but also there is obvious vacillation in the method and purpose of St. Jerome himself. Granted that he knew sufficient Hebrew to check up on his Jewish teachers and advisers, there are also his own statements that he sometimes departed from the Hebrew text,

* Paper read at the Meeting of the Society of Old Testament Study held in Manchester, September, 1948.

¹ Publications of the American Oriental Society, Offprint Series No. 13. New Haven, Conn. 1941, pp. 84ff.

² *The Proto-Septuagint Question*, JQR, NS xxxiii (1943), pp. 497-9.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 85.

⁴ *Ibid.*

preferring, e.g., either a LXX or Old Latin reading, or Symmachus, or, again, a Midrashic rendering. It would be impossible to produce textual proof that all the renderings which Jerome used represent a parent Hebrew text, much less a uniform archetype for each instance. Origen, because of his dependence in the Hexapla on other sources, must be considered later. Symmachus has strong affinities with the M.T., but that is different from a postulated identical text-form for both, for Symmachus also has affinities with the Septuagint. Aquila, still frequently regarded as a ridiculously literal rendering of the M.T., is said to contain variants from the present M.T. at the rate of one in every second verse.⁵ Theodotion fails to support the supposition on two grounds: firstly, the *Ur*-Theodotion, generally regarded as basic to Theodotionic readings, is to be traced back to a period before that presupposed for the M.T. archetype, and therefore cannot be expected to conform with it; secondly, a glance at the *apparatus criticus* of the text of Daniel in *BH*³ shows that the divergences between the Theodotionic text and the M.T. are considerable. It follows that Origen, likewise, must be disallowed, because it was from these renderings, particularly Theodotion, that he obtained his readings when squaring his reconstructed LXX with the Hebrew text in the Hexapla. The Hexapla is further to be disallowed because of the text-form of the first two columns, the Hebrew and the Greek transcription. So far as I know, remnants of the Hebrew text in column 1 do not exist. But the transcription in column II has been carefully studied. In spite of the prolonged delay of the publication of Cardinal Mercati's treatment of the Milan palimpsest, a detailed discussion of grammatical forms has been published by Einar Brønno.⁶ He observes that in 131 verses of transcribed texts of various Psalms in this 10th century palimpsest there are 88 forms which are at variance with the M.T., and of these 18 show consonantal variations which, Brønno explains, consist of the one text-form having consonants not present in the other, or having consonants which differ in both.⁷ But we shall return to this list later.

The evidence of the Mishnah and Talmud for the supposed archetype is different from that of the versions, for here we deal with quotations and text-forms in Hebrew, and therefore the problems of translation and transcription do not arise. But Orlinsky's argument is again not substantiated. He refers in defence of his view to the work of Aptowitzer,⁸ but it is in precisely the same work that Kahle finds adequate proof to refute the theory. Aptowitzer does show that the whole history of Rabbinic literature, down to the 8th and 9th centuries A.D., reveals divergent forms of the Hebrew text current in Rabbinic circles: variants which have also, to some extent, been established in the older versions, such as the LXX, Targumim, Peshitta. Furthermore, H. L. Strack, in his *Prolegomena*,⁹ has listed 111 text-variants in Rabbinic works which provide ample illustration of the same fact.

Finally, the existence of divergent text-forms is, I think, presupposed by the persistence of *Qrê* and *Kthibh* readings throughout the period of Massoretic activity in the pre-Tiberian stages. There are frequent instances in pre-

⁵ So BENTZEN, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (E.T. 1948), I, p. 56, after STEUER-NAGEL, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1912), p. 21. It would be interesting to discover how this average was computed, for, if it is based on FIELD or HATCH and REDPATH, it is likely to be textually unsound because these works were largely based on quotations from the Fathers.

⁶ *Studien über Hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus*. Leipzig, 1943. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. Bd. xxviii.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 445f.

⁸ *Das Schriftwort in der Rabbinischen Literatur*. Wien, 1906-15.

⁹ *Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*. Leipzig, 1873.

Tiberian Hebrew manuscripts where the readings are those of the margin or *Qrê* in the Tiberian *textus receptus*. Thus far it is obvious that Orlinsky's adherence to the view of a carefully transmitted archetype cannot be justified.

But there is, I suggest, a fundamental truth in the basis of Orlinsky's argument. Kahle, and particularly Sperber, may have gone too far in the other direction when they emphasise the divergent text-forms which, they argue, are presupposed by the emergence of the M.T. By analogy, Kahle would make the divergences in the various Massoretic texts as far-reaching as those between the recensions of the LXX. He speaks of reconstructing a text-form which was "the Babylonian text of the Bible",¹⁰ and he interprets the reference in the colophon of the ben Asher Codex of the Prophets in 895 A.D. to the careful preservation of the consonantal text as indicating that variant readings were expunged from it.¹¹ Again, the numerous references in Rabbinic literature to the "corrected" manuscript, the *sefer mugah*, are explained by him as referring not merely to the correction of scribal errors but to the expunging of variant readings. Now if these explanations are correct, we may conclude the presence of major differences of text-forms in the now hidden history of Massoretic activity. But surely a more correct emphasis must be on the comparative identity and uniformity of the text-form as transmitted during the Christian era, very much in contrast to the transmission of Christian texts, both LXX and New Testament. In spite of divergences, there is an essential similarity between the M.T. and the versions mentioned by Orlinsky. Thus it is, or at least it should be, axiomatic that for the purposes of emending the M.T., in the strict sense, first importance should go to the post-1st century A.D. versions, but the very fact that these can be used but infrequently shows that there was a uniformity of the parent text. Again, Origen had a Hebrew text which he regarded as official to the extent that it was the basis of all Greek renderings to be used by the Church. Now though this text has been shown to have divergences at the rate of 88 per 131 verses in the transcription column, it does not follow that its parent was such a different recension as might be supposed at first sight. The examination by Brønno¹² shows that the variants are in the main differences of orthography, which may be explained as variation of pronunciation or dialect. A few examples might be quoted to illustrate this: Column 11 has μεσσωλ in Ps. 30.4, whereas M.T. has *min-she'ol*; it has confused *z* and *sh* in *nigrasti* in Ps. 31.23; in 32.9 it has θου for M.T. *tihyu*, which is explained, as Brønno admits after Margolis, on grammatical grounds¹³; in Ps. 35.25 Origen has λβαβ instead of M.T. *lebh*; and again in 89.38 it has λωλαμ for *'olam*, where there is also support for Origen in 16 Hebrew MSS, LXX and Peshitta.¹⁴ As Brønno admits,¹⁵ the only instance of a substantial change is 49.13, where Origen has βακαρ and M.T. *biqar*, and the parallelism in the passage suggests that Origen has the better reading.¹⁶ The same general conclusion of dialect or local variations may be drawn from an examination of the transcript of Ps. 30 given by Kahle in *The Cairo Geniza*,¹⁷ where only one word differs consonantly from the M.T., and this

¹⁰ *The Cairo Geniza*. London, 1947, p. 44.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

¹² *Op cit.*, especially pp. 445ff.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

¹⁴ *Bib. Heb.*³, *ad loc.*

¹⁵ BRËNNO. *op. cit.*, p. 446.

¹⁶ *Cf. Bib. Heb.*³, *ad. loc.*

¹⁷ p. 88.

is to be explained on grounds other than a different recension, viz. as a textual corruption.¹⁸

Continuing this suggestion of variant readings as evidence of dialect forms, the following characteristics of the dialect of Origen II may be mentioned: the failure to pronounce gutturals; though this may have been a general characteristic of recited Hebrew of those days; the z.s.m. suffixes presuppose *-ākh* or *-āt*, not *-khā* and *-tā* as in Tiberian; the omission of final *-āh*.

Subsequent centuries provide far more abundant and exact sources for an examination of the pre-Tiberian textual transmission. I refer, of course, to the manuscripts mainly from the Cairo Geniza and the two Firkowitsch collections, with texts pointed in the Palestinian and the two Babylonian vocalisations. Perhaps a word of warning might remove a wrong impression which may prevail in the treatment of these discoveries. The Geniza was the depository of discarded and unwanted manuscripts, which, though they had been used for years, were now awaiting destruction. As Kahle so frequently remarks, it was not an archive for conserving official texts, though the manuscripts conserved had, at some time, been so used. Therefore, generally speaking, Geniza fragments are related to the study of the text-transmission in much the same way as ceramics are used in the science of archaeology. They are the remains of scripts which had been mainly used for the individual purposes of their owners. Our danger is to attach too great a significance to some characteristic or idiosyncrasy of a particular manuscript. There are many indications of the unofficial character of the Cairo manuscripts. Thus, the absence of consistency in the way texts are pointed shows that it is not one classical form of pronunciation that is to be presented through them, but rather that the manuscripts simply guided the person who read them. The abbreviated texts indicate the same thing, for here the manuscripts consist simply of the first word of a verse written in full, followed by those consonants which have a significance for the vocalisation or accentuation. Again, many Palestinian and Babylonian texts bear also Tiberian vowel signs, and it is thought that these are re-pointed texts which show that when the Tiberian vocalisation became official, all available manuscripts were brought into line with it. But in many instances the Tiberian vowel marks agree not with the Tiberian vocalisation but with the Babylonian or Palestinian vowels which they replace; thus, e.g., *'āsher* is often pointed not with *hateph pathah* but with *pathah*, which coincides with the Babylonian vocalisation. Still another indication is that many of the manuscripts are not supplied with a Massorah. The Massoretic notes were generally attached to manuscripts which were official text-forms, and their absence from so many Geniza fragments testifies to the comparative unimportance of these manuscripts.

Thus, when Geniza manuscripts are studied, it is perhaps better to regard them as part of the domestic history of the transmission of the text, than as a standard or official text-form and vocalisation. They were aids to memory, as instanced by the abbreviated texts, aids to pointing, as in the instances of manuscripts with two kinds of pointing, or, as instanced in a later Geniza MS. in the British Museum, where the Hebrew text is given Arabic vowel marks. In these respects, the Geniza fragments are not to be regarded as equal in value with, e.g., Origen II, for the latter, in spite of its being a transcription, represents a standard, official rendering, at least sufficiently official to be placed alongside the other six columns of the Hexapla, whereas the former were simply notes or even exercises. It is probable, too, that these Geniza manuscripts were not so carefully copied as were the official texts, and contained many

¹⁸ Cf. BRØNNO, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

more scribal errors. An interesting instance is given in Facs. 2 in *Masoreten des Ostens*,¹⁹ viz. the Berlin MS. or. qu. 680, which shows an omission in Job 38.5, with three missing stichoi inserted in the middle and side margins by a second and third scribe.

Because they are unofficial, however, these Babylonian and Palestinian vocalised texts are of the greatest importance for the history of the pre-Tiberian textual transmission, and particularly for an understanding of the work at various centres and academies in Babylon and Palestine. The centres are to be carefully distinguished, as far as possible, for divergences of transmission are to be expected from every one. Further, Massorôth and all available Massoretic lists must be carefully distinguished, because each preserves its own individuality in the pre-Tiberian period and later, until the adoption of the ben Asher text by the decree of Maimonides.

Some divergences of transmission may be noted here. Kahle²⁰ emphasises that Palestinian manuscripts show variants in the consonantal text which, he says, presuppose the adherence of the scribes to divergent text-forms. One instance is his MS M.1,²¹ which in Exod. 28.30 agrees with the LXX in reading *משפטי*, and not the singular as in M.T. Another manuscript, H, which contains a portion of Daniel, 9.24-12.13, has numerous variants,²² especially divergent in *scriptio plena* and *defectiva*. An examination of these and the other divergences reveal, however, that it is but seldom indeed that they are more than the addition or omission of the consonants י, ה, ה, —a characteristic by no means confined to this manuscript. Other variants are the substitution of 'al for 'ad, 'el for 'al, eloha for 'el. A Hithpa'el occurs instead of a Niph'al in 12.10, which is more serious. In 11.8 there is a transposition of *zahabh wakhesef*, which is paralleled by Kennicott 245, and in 11.15 we have the reading *melekh hannegebh* for *m. hassafon*, —a feature which finds its counterpart in Targumic renderings. But apart from the last substitution there is nothing in the variants which would require the drastic theory of a divergent text to account for them. They are phenomena which occur also at a period later than the emergence of the ben Asher text.

Another Palestinian manuscript has been mentioned by Kahle in *The Cairo Geniza* as bearing a variant reading. It is *homez* for *haron*, presumably from Ps. 58.10.²³ But the lexica show that the versions and later commentators have always found difficulty with this word, and it is not surprising that still another variant exists. That the variant is an otherwise α. λ, and does not give very good sense, is difficult to explain.

Failure to preserve a text scrupulously identical with the Tiberian *textus receptus* is found equally frequently in Babylonian manuscripts. The MS already referred to, Berlin or. qu. 680, shows that in Job 38.12 the consonantal text corresponds to the Tiberian *Qrê*, and not the *Kthibh*. On the other hand, vv. 13 and 15 show that the Massoretic rule of a suspended 'ayin in *r'sha'im* was followed. Examples abound in Babylonian manuscripts of the Tiberian *Qrê* in the consonantal text. But a perusal of Ginsburg's Hebrew Bible shows that this divergence again was not confined to pre-Tiberian times, and I think it is wrong to regard their presence in pre-ben Asher texts as signs of recensions

¹⁹ P. KAHLE. Leipzig, 1913.

²⁰ *Masoreten des Westens*, II. Stuttgart, 1930, p. 36†.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² They are listed by KAHLE, *Mas. d. Westens* II, pp. 22†-24†.

²³ p. 54. n. 1. The note gives the reference as Ps. 56.10; presumably it should be 58.10, though the text is not given in full by KAHLE.

and in post-ben Asher texts as of no significance.²⁴ The importance of consonantal variations in Babylonian texts is, however, not seriously advocated even by Kahle, for in his view the consonantal text had been fixed and scrupulously copied by that time. The evidence for divergent transmission is of quite a different class, and there seems to be no gainsaying its existence. The following are its main features: an independent scheme of vocalisation, with the development from simple to complex; different Massorah, with its own technical terms; the attaching of the Targum to every verse in the Prophets and Writings; different division of the text into lections. Thus, the difference between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmudim is reflected also in the differences of text-transmission between the Babylonian and Palestinian schools.

In view of this difference, the similarity of consonantal transmission is the more surprising, and should be regarded as a strong argument in favour of the traditional theory of one classic text-form for all centres. It minimises the impression left by Kahle's emphasis on an independent recensional transmission. Thus, when Kahle says that he has achieved "a broad foundation for the Babylonian text of the Bible,"²⁵ it should mean no more than the reconstruction of the text-form transmitted there. An examination of it shows that the only real divergences are those of orthography and vocalisation. Again, the development so adequately explained by Kahle from the simple to the complex vocalisation is to be understood as a refinement of the pronunciation, not the emergence of a different recension of the text.

Thus the position regarding all known forms of the pre-Tiberian Hebrew Bible, is that the variants are, with but few exceptions, those of orthography and vocalisation, and are of very little textual significance. They do not reveal any of the usual marks of recensions; they have no tendentiousness, such as the avoidance of anthropomorphisms; the camouflage of the Ineffable Name had long since been adopted, though not always the same way, by all schools of tradition. Even in the matter of vocalisation there was broad uniformity, for the pronunciation was basically the same for all types of Babylonian, Palestinian and Tiberian pointing.

Is, then, Orlinsky right, and Kahle and his school wrong? I think that the differences between them could be resolved, and both interpretations brought together, by what may be described as a less vehemently enthusiastic statement of the case. Orlinsky and the followers of de Lagarde are obviously wrong if they insist on a scrupulous transmission of an archetype; Kahle, on the other hand, has overstated the case if we are to be persuaded that "east was east, and west was west, and ne'er the twain did meet" in the pre-Tiberian textual transmission.

But there is a major significance in Kahle's studies, which is that the pre-Tiberian vocalisations preserve for us various differences of dialect and pronunciation from the period before the fixing of the classical pointing. In such dialect forms we approach a language much nearer spoken Hebrew than is possible through the Tiberian, with the Qaraite and other influences playing upon it. For this reason we appreciate the principles of Kahle's work, and again those of Sperber, for their studies of pre-Tiberian Hebrew grammar, and likewise Brønno's treatment of the morphology and vocalisation of Origen II. On their bases a comparison of Hebrew dialects can be made which are less artificial and more akin to the real Hebrew language.

²⁴ Cf. *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 54.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Caution is necessary if the sources to be used for such a reconstruction be extended further than the Babylonian and Tiberian vocalised texts and the transcription of Origen. Thus, transliterations in various LXX manuscripts must be scrutinised for traces of recensional influence, and all early quotations, even of Origen II, must likewise be scrutinised. This places the quotations in Hatch and Redpath's Concordance, vol. 3, on a very indifferent plane compared with the remains of the column discovered in the Mercati palimpsest. Likewise, Reider's otherwise informative *Prolegomena to an Index of Aquila*²⁶ suffers because of its dependence on Field. Transliterations in Jerome's works must be limited to confirmatory use: Father Sutcliffe's article in *Biblica*²⁷ gives adequate demonstration of this fact. At the same time, Massoretic lists of variants, such as lists of ben Naphtali readings, cannot be indiscriminately used, because it is always possible that words have been included in them which did not strictly belong to that school, but had different provenances and became so listed simply because they were variants. These reasons justify the suggestion already made that a reconstructed pre-Tiberian Hebrew grammar should confine itself to the remains in the Mercati palimpsest, and the available Hebrew manuscripts with Babylonian and Palestinian pointing, as dealt with by Kahle in *Masoreten des Ostens*, *Masoreten des Westens* I and II, and the invaluable collection of 70 facsimiles published by Kahle in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, NF 5, 1928, together with further manuscripts with Babylonian pointing for which the catalogue in the prolegomena to *Bib. Heb.*³ is indispensable.

The divergences in these manuscript sources, and between them and the *textus receptus*, are the means whereby different dialect forms are to be established—but the task is by no means straightforward. According to Kahle²⁸ neither his own pupil, Sperber, nor Brønno can demand general acceptance for their theories. The basic fact for all such work is, I think, that the divergences of vocalisation do not imply a divergent text-form, but a different dialect or way of recitation at the various synagogues and centres of Massoretic learning.

In brief outline, the following dialect features may be said to have been established: (1) from Origen II.²⁹ The most important conclusions made by Brønno are:—

(a) Verbs: 1. the 2.s.m. ending is generally θ , sometimes $\theta\alpha$. 2. There is not a consistent development of \dot{a} in the Imperfect of some ע"פ verbs. 3. The prefix of the Pi'el participle, as well as the Hiph'il is $\mu\alpha$. 4. The perfect Hiph'il has sometimes a development which approximates to the Tiberian segholation, thus **hikhteḥet*. 5. There are frequent divergences of conjugation between Origen II and Tiberian M.T.

(b) Nouns: 1. Segholation of originally monosyllabic nouns does not occur. 2. Considerable difference between the pausal form here and in M.T. 3. In initial μ -nouns the prefix is usually $\mu\alpha$, whereas in M.T., the majority are *mi*: in this feature the column is again in agreement with Babylonian manuscripts, though there are divergences in individual cases between the two. 4. Suffixes: the 2.s.m. is $\alpha\chi$, with an occasional *nun energeticum* form having final α .

Thus far the reconstruction is comparatively simple, for the basic element is provided by the consonants. But when the column is examined for voca-

²⁶ Philadelphia, 1916.

²⁷ St. Jerome's Pronunciation of Hebrew. *Biblica*, 29 (1948), pp. 112-125.

²⁸ *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 165, note 2; p. 234.

²⁹ Cf. BRØNNO, *op. cit.*, pp. 448-463.

lisation the problems are more intricate, and conclusions must be tentative. It is obvious that the Hebrew gutturals are not represented in the column, either because the Greek alphabet could not supply the necessary letters, or, as is known from Rabbinic sources, Palestinian Jews in those times did not pronounce them. It is also impossible to establish how far the vowel values of Greek coincided with those of their contemporary Hebrew counterparts, or again how both compared with Tiberian vocalisation. Thus Brønno's interpretation of the use of *ε* in certain cases brings him to the conclusion that Philippi's law, that *i* in a closed accented syllable becomes *ā* before the dropping of the final vowel, does not hold for Origen II—a statement which has brought a sharp criticism from F. R. Blake.³⁰ This question, in turn, leads to a criticism of Brønno's work by Kahle,³¹ that "he compares the transcribed forms . . . directly with the forms fixed by the Tiberian Massoretes." Whilst agreeing with Kahle that material in pre-Tiberian vocalised texts is of the greatest importance for comparison with Origen II, I think it is also true that in the last resort Brønno could do only as he did, for otherwise he would be comparing together a number of fluid and variable dialects.

(2) From Palestinian vocalised texts come the following conclusions based on facsimiles and notes in Kahle's *Masoreten des Westens*³²:

(a) In MS H³³ we have the following features: 1. An *e* sound precedes the consonant, where Tiberian has *i*, e.g. Ezek. 13.22, has *hekk'abhtiv* for Tiberian *hikk'abhtiv*. 2. In Ezek. 14.3 we have '*eddārāsh* for Tib. '*iddārēsh*, a form which has its counterpart in the Babylonian vocalisation. 3. In Ezek. 14.13, a Hiph'il *tehti*' is used where Tib. has Qal, and in 16. 25, 26, 29, the form *tirbi* occurs for Tib. *tarbi*.

(b) MS J. A notable feature here is that the same sign is used for the Tiberian *šere*, *seghol*, *vocal shewa* and *hateph-seghol*. This may be due, as Kahle argues, to the later refinements of the Tiberians, or, on the other hand, to the identity of the sounds in the dialect presupposed here.

(c) MS K. The form *ye'shshammu* in Jer. 2.3, is regarded as *ש"ש*, whereas Tib. *ye'shamu* makes it a normal *ש"ב* verb. In 2.7, there is an instance of a Hithpa'el, *watēttam'u*, where Tib. reads Pi'el.³⁴

(d) MS L. has a vowel mark which, among other usages, denotes a segholate, but with no distinction between nouns which, in Tiberian, are from *a* or *i* monosyllabic forms. Thus the Tiberian *hesed* (Ps. 52.5), *sedeq* (ditto), *neged* (52.11) and '*ēbher* (55.7), *sēfer* (69.29), '*ēqebh* (70.4) and others have all the same pointing. Furthermore, there is no difference here between the two vowels of the segholate.

Variant forms and grammatical features in fragments of Piyuttim with Palestinian pointing provide further examples of dialect variations.

(3) Finally, there are the Babylonian vocalised texts. When the oriental transmission is examined, the first care is that the distinction made by Kahle between simple and complex vocalisations be observed. These are not to be understood as simply forming a continuous development, with a straightforward

³⁰ J.N.E.S. VI 1947, pp. 192f. (Review of BRØNNO's book).

³¹ *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 232ff.

³² Vol. II, pp. 14⁺-42⁺, esp. 35⁺-42⁺.

³³ *Mas d. Westens*, II, pp. 16⁺ f.

³⁴ KAHLE objects to the form because of the inappropriate meaning, and emends by reading the *daghesh* sign over the following consonant, which would bring it into line with the Tiberian vocalisation. (*Ibid.*, p. 25⁺.)

transition, for they also existed alongside each other.³⁵ Kahle has reconstructed as follows: in certain districts of the Babylonian transmission a more exact vocalisation was undertaken, and in other districts the simple form was retained.³⁶ The complex Babylonian has affinities with the Tiberian, both showing the influence of the Qaraïtes. Simple vocalised texts are, on the whole, earlier—7th and 8th centuries, compared with the 8th and 9th for the complex. It is the former that is basic for the Yemenite vocalisation.³⁷

For the present purpose of indicating dialect forms, the following features are important: 1. The present distinction between Sephardic and Ashkenazic pronunciation of *qameš* may be regarded as the successor of the divergence between Babylonian and Palestinian-Tiberian pronunciation of the *a* sound, with the former regarding every *qameš* as *a*, and the latter giving it an *ā* or *o* value. 2. The conjunction *waw*, when it occurs before a consonant without a full vowel, is always pointed with an *i* vowel, in contrast to the Tiberian, which might have *shureq*. 3. The occurrence in more than one Babylonian manuscript of a Pi'el form of the verb '*anah*, with the meaning of "to answer," "to grant,"³⁸ a form which does not occur anywhere in the M.T. It happens twice in the perfect with a suffix, viz., Is. 49.8, Ps. 22.22, and once in a participial form, Micah 3.7. The MSS are listed in BH³ as Eb 10 and Ec 2. But it would be tedious to trace here all instances of this kind of variation in the Babylonian manuscripts.

Before concluding it may be permitted to return to the question of whether or not these divergences constitute recensions. We cannot allow that they are recensions in the same sense as those found in Symmachus, Theodotion or the LXX, for there is not the same significance in the variants. In this respect Orlinsky appears to be correct, and it is the M.T. itself which is a recension. On the other hand, the dialect divergences, and other considerations presuppose independent transmissions of the text-form, which retain carefully preserved traditions embodied in vocalisations and Massorôth. For this reason "recension" is, I think, the best word to use, because the alternative "text-form" would often be misleading, or at least too indefinite and colourless.

Bangor.

BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS.

³⁵ Cf. *Mas. d. Ostens*, p. 157.

³⁶ *ZAW* 5, NF, 1928, p. 117.

³⁷ *Mas. d. Ostens*, p. 157. The work of KAHLE on the Babylonian texts cannot be too highly evaluated for the study of pre-Tiberian Massoretic Hebrew. I refer particularly to: *Der masorethische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*. (Leipzig, 1902), and the complementary chapter *Das Hebräische nach östlicher Überlieferung in Mas. d. Ostens*, pp. 181-199.

³⁸ *Mas. d. Ostens*, pp. 122 and 189.

THE OLDEST DATED DOCUMENT IN THE GENIZAH ?

I. Abrahams published in JQR, XVII, p. 426, under the title, 'An Eighth-Century Genizah Document,' a deed of covenant drawn up in Fustaṭ, stressing its importance both from the palaeographical and historical point of view. The date given in the document is explicit: "Wednesday, Kislev 11th, in the year 1062 of the era used in Fustaṭ," i.e. the Seleucid era, corresponding to 750 C.E. This date which, in the document, is given in words, not in figures,¹ has been accepted and the document regarded as the oldest so far found in the Genizah.²

There are, however, serious difficulties in accepting this date as correct. In the first place, the writing of the document is, on the palaeographical evidence, many centuries later. It is closely related to the writing of another document (a settlement of a claim) in the Genizah, T-S. 16, 145, also drawn up in Fustaṭ in the XIth century, which has been published by Mann.³ Secondly, both these documents are distinguished by a highly developed legal phraseology,⁴ and in both of them the same technical procedure was adopted. The scribe of the Court repeated at the end of the legal instrument the words written between the lines of the document.⁵ This was a device to safeguard the validity of the text and of the supralinear insertions. Thirdly, the same signature of Samuel b. Abraham⁶ appears in both documents, and in both cases he signs in his capacity as official of the Court.⁷ Finally, the date 750 (of Abrahams's document) conflicts with the internal evidence in the document. The declarant of the document pledges himself in case of breach of his engagement to pay a fine of twenty dinars for the benefit of "the two Synagogues,"⁸ by which the Palestinian and the Babylonian synagogue in Fustaṭ are obviously meant. But the Palestinian synagogue in Fustaṭ was built only in 1025!⁹ It may also be remarked that the earmarking of the fine

¹ See facsimile facing p. 428 of ABRAHAM'S paper. The original is in CUL, T-S. 16, 79.

² A. MARX, *The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish History*. Reprint from the *Proceedings of American Academy for Jewish Research*, N.Y., vol. XVI (1947), 203 and n. 98.

³ *Texts and Studies, etc.*, Cincinnati, 1931, I, p. 376. A facsimile of this document, reduced in scale, is given on p. 721. The affinity of the writing in both documents becomes more evident when the originals are examined.

⁴ cfr. ABRAHAM'S, p. 430, and MANN, p. 371.

⁵ In the document published by MANN eight words are repeated at the end, and only two in that published by ABRAHAM'S. In his detailed description of the document ABRAHAM'S stated (p. 427) that three words are written above the line in the original. In fact, there are only two, in lines 2 and 9. The third word (or rather traces of it) in line 15 has been displaced by the damage and shrinkage of the vellum.

⁶ The signature is identical in both documents, although in the document published by ABRAHAM'S it is bolder (executed with a thick pen) than in the other document. The former document is written on vellum and the latter on paper and this may also account for the slightly different appearance of the signature.

⁷ He appears as a member of the Court in MANN's document, and at least as an official of the Court in ABRAHAM'S document. The latter was drawn up in Court, and the first two signatures appearing on it may be assumed to be those of Court officials. This assumption is based on the evidence offered by MANN's document, in which the first two signatures of Sa'adyah bar Ephraim he-Habher and Mebhorkh ben Sa'id are stated in the testatum to be known to the Beth Din. They were obviously its officials.

⁸ The vellum is damaged where the words "the two synagogues" are written, but the correct reading can be established from the remaining traces of the letters as well as by comparison with similar expressions (See ABRAHAM'S, p. 430).

⁹ See MANN, *op. cit.* II 206, n. 161. The Qaraite synagogue was built in 1004. See also MANN, *Jews in Egypt*, II 375.

for the synagogues, both of which would benefit from it in equal shares, as stated explicitly in the deed, indicates that a common Court (Beth-Din) for Palestinians and Babylonians was already functioning at the time when the document was drawn up. But, again, such a united Beth-Din was not, apparently, set up before the XIth century.¹⁰

The date 1062 Sel. era corresponding to 750 C.E. in the document published by Abrahams is, therefore, as it stands, undoubtedly wrong, and we must assume that the scribe omitted, perhaps through inadvertence,¹¹ to insert the words "three hundred" after "one thousand." The correct date of the document would, thus, be 1362, Seleucid era, corresponding to 1050 C.E., and it would be perfectly consistent with the palæographical and other evidence. Further confirmation that the correct date of the document is 1050 may be found in the following circumstance. According to the date as it stands in the document, the latter was drawn up on Wednesday, Kislev 11th, 1062 Sel. era (A.M. 4511). But in that year Kislev 11th fell on a Sunday and not on a Wednesday. In the year 1362, Sel. era (A.M. 4811), however, Kislev 11th did fall on a Wednesday.

The correct date, 1050, will assist us also in identifying 'Abu 'Ali [al] Ḥasan of Bagdad, head of the community of Fuṣṭaṭ (Rosh haqqahal), who is mentioned in the document and who has been up to the present a mystery. He is undoubtedly a scion of the renowned al-Tustari family, of Babylonian origin, the members of which played a very prominent part in Fuṣṭaṭ as communal leaders.¹² 'Abu 'Ali Ḥasan, as it appears from our document, still continued the family tradition in 1050. According to another source, however, he was soon afterwards appointed Wezīr, and for a second time in 1053-4.¹³ It may be assumed that he then abandoned the leadership of the community and also the faith of his fathers.

The result of this inquiry about the date of the allegedly oldest Geniza document has a bearing on the whole question of dating the material found in the Cairo Geniza. The Synagogue in Old Cairo, in which the Geniza was situated, did not exist before 882, when the Church of St. Michael was bought by Jews and converted into their place of worship. The implication of this date is that we cannot, as a rule, reasonably expect to find in the Cairo Geniza manuscripts older than the first half of the IXth century. Manuscripts, unless preserved under special conditions in archives, libraries, Synagogues, Churches or Genizoth, have, generally speaking, a very short span of life. The instance of the Ismaili literature is very instructive in this respect: no text older than half a century has, apparently, survived. The case of the State archives in Constantinople is equally significant: although the collection of documents dating since the time of the conquest of the city by the Turks are practically complete, apparently only one document dated half a century earlier is still preserved.

Judging by analogy with these instances, we may presume that the first fragments of the manuscripts deposited in the Cairo Geniza were, at the utmost, not more than half a century old; and, as the Geniza was available only a few years after 882, their date (if they have survived) was, at the best, between the thirties and forties of the IXth century.

¹⁰ See MANN, *Texts, etc.*, I 319, n. 28a.

¹¹ The scribe of the document seems to have been rather careless; see ABRAHAMS, *op. cit.*, p. 429.

¹² See MANN, *Texts, etc.*, I 371 and 375 where a genealogical table of the family is given.

¹³ See List of Wezīrs given in WÜSTENFELD, *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen*, III 27. Cpr. MANN, *Jews in Egypt*, I 78, n. 2.

The date 750 assigned to the document discussed above militated against this presumption; but this obstacle has now been removed. The manuscript of Aquila's Greek translation of the Bible is an exception confirming this presumption. Although this manuscript goes back to the IVth century, it was used in the IXth-Xth century by the Jewish scribe who wrote Yannai's Piyutim on top of it. Aquila's manuscript (together with other non-Jewish material) was probably found in the Church of St. Michael when it became the property of the Jews.

To conclude, no manuscript found in the Cairo Geniza should, as a rule, be presumed to be older than about the middle of the IXth century, unless there are cogent reasons to assign it to an earlier period.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

RABBI SIMEON, THE AUTHOR OF MAIMONIDES' "TREATISE ON LOGIC"

The Hebrew translation by Moses Ibn Tibbon of Maimonides' "Treatise on Logic," generally known under the title of *מלות ההגיון*, was published by John Frobenius in Bâle in 1527. A Latin translation by Sebastian Münster of the Hebrew text was also included in this edition, which bears the strange title: *לוגיקה של החכם רבי שמעון* (*Logica Sapientis Rabbi Simeonis*).

The bibliographers who have examined this edition and pointed out the great shortcomings of the Latin translation have been puzzled by the fact that such a peculiar title should have been given to the tract, in the first line of which the name of the author is given *אמר רבינו משה בן כבוד רבי מימון ז"ל*, but they do not seem to have attempted any explanation.¹

The solution of this small bibliographical problem may be found in a passage of Münster's dedication of the tract to John van den Campen. The humanist of Bâle, after describing his endeavours on behalf of Hebrew literature continues:

Misit et ob eam causam Symon ille Grynaeus . . . exemplar quoddam logicum, quod ex Pannonia inferiori secum Budorim attulit.

Sebastian Münster obviously considered the "Treatise" to be anonymous despite the "incipit," and he designated it by the name of the scholar who had supplied him with the manuscript. He disguised this name under that of "Rabbi Simeon," intending in this manner to pay homage to the learning of that humanist.

Simon Grynaeus, who was born at Vehrigen (Swabia) in 1493 and died in Strasbourg in 1541, was professor of Classics and took an active part in the Reformation movement in many universities, among them, from 1529, Bâle University. At the time of the publication of Maimonides' "Treatise" he was apparently in Buderich (Budoris) in the Rhineland. He gained fame especially through his discovery of the last five books of Livy.

P. KLEIN.

Paris.

¹M. STEINSCHNEIDER describes the booklet in his *Catalogue* col. 2,014, as *Vers. lat. Logices R. Simon*. [potius Mosis Maimonidis]; cpr. also M. VENTURA's edition, *Terminologie logique de Maimonide*, Paris, 1

SURVEY OF CURRENT LITERATURE

G. ÖSTBORN. *Tôrā in the Old Testament: A Semantic Study*. 1945. Pp. 212. Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, Lund.

The problem of "law" in the Old Testament raises questions which range over a wide field of study. A full discussion of the problem would need to take account of Biblical theology, of religious history, of philology, of the relationship of Old Testament law to other ancient oriental codes of law, and so on. In this study the author has refrained from the attempt to traverse the whole vast field, and has concentrated mainly upon the problem of "the exact connotation of the commonest term for 'law' תורה," for "a sound definition of the basic meaning of the term תורה and the successful elucidation of its semantic development would greatly facilitate our understanding of the specific תורה-passages in the writings of the O.T." (p. 2). The author begins his study with an examination of the etymology of *tôrā* (Ch. I, pp. 4-22), and then goes on to classify the terms *hōrā* and *tôrā* in groups according to the person imparting *tôrā*—the deity (Ch. II, pp. 23-53), the king (Ch. III, pp. 54-88), the priest (Ch. IV, pp. 89-111), the wise man (Ch. V, pp. 112-126), and the prophet (Ch. VI, pp. 127-168). This classification aims not only at providing a clearer insight into the extent to which *tôrā* was communicated within the various circles where it was imparted, but also into the nature of the *tôrā* imparted (p. 22). There is an Appendix (pp. 172-178) which lists the occurrences of *hōrā* ("to impart *tôrā*") and *tôrā* in the M.T. and the Samaritan Pentateuch, as well as their renderings in the LXX and other ancient versions. There are several indices (pp. 179-193), a very full bibliography (pp. 194-212), and copious footnotes throughout.

In Ch. I the author provides a useful survey of the various explanations of the etymology of *tôrā* which have from time to time been offered. Following Gesenius and others, he finds the primary meaning of *hōrā* to consist in "stretch out the finger, point the way." The basic meaning of *tôrā* is thus held to be "indication with the finger" or "showing the way." There may also be, the author thinks, some affinity between *hōrā* and *tôrā* and the Accadian *wa'aru* "go, send," and *aru* "go, lead, conduct (instruct?)," and so "sending or leading on the way" becomes a possible meaning of *tôrā*. It is from the basic meanings "showing the way" and "guiding on the way" that there evolve the further meanings "directive," "instruction," "law." In preferring the explanation "indication with

the finger, showing the way" for *tôrā* the author can claim support from a large number of scholars. He is, of course, aware that weighty support can be found also in favour of the view, commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen, that *tôrā* meant originally "casting lots," then more generally "direction, instruction." In fact he himself says that "there are sound material reasons in favour of both interpretations" (p. 12). But the author has to make his choice; and where there is no unanimity among scholars, who shall say that he is wrong, even though one may harbour a preference for the view which he rejects? The problem of the connection between *tôrā* and the Accadian *turtu* receives some discussion, and the theory that *tôrā* is a loanword in Hebrew from Accadian is found by the author—rightly we think—to be unacceptable (p. 17ff.; cp. p. 52, 95, 169).

As for the remaining chapters, it is only possible, within the space allowed, to offer three comments. In the first place, the author is sometimes inclined to build up a case on flimsy foundations. He seems conscious of this himself, for, in reference to Chs. II and III, he writes: "we were partly moving in the realm of theory" (p. 89). Some illustration may be given, taken from Ch. III. It is a striking fact, as the author points out, that never is *hōrā* used with any of the historical kings as subject, nor does *tôrā* occur in the sense of "direction, instruction" in connection with a king. The author can, in fact, write: "Thus the king does not seem to have been a *mōre*, viz., a shower of the way, instructor" (p. 56). The imparting of *tôrā* was, however, it is maintained, a royal function, and certain evidence is adduced in support of this view. It is not always impressive. For example, while the author holds, with reference to Isaiah xlii 4, that the Servant of the Lord is to be thought of as imparting *tôrā* in his capacity as king, he allows the possibility that the Servant could be thought of also as prophet, or priest, or teacher of wisdom (p. 56f). And again, with regard to Moses, he concedes that it may be difficult to decide which of his rôles is the more prominent when he delivers *tôrā*—that of chief-king or that of priest (p. 58). Nor do his remarks concerning *tôrā* in connection with David and other kings greatly help his case (p. 70ff.) In the second place, it can be said that, when the author treads firmer ground, he has many good things to say. He is at his best when he is discussing the priest and prophet as imparters of *tôrā* (in Chs. IV and VI). Attention may be called especi-

ally, for example, to his remarks on the prophet's view of the priest as the true impartor of *tōrā* (p. 107ff); his view that the prophets could not be opposed to the cultus as such—it was against the cultus in its contemporary guise that they directed their polemic (p. 145ff); his emphasis on the presence in ancient oriental religions of a lofty ethical consciousness, and his statement as to what is peculiarly characteristic of Israelite religion in this respect (p. 149); and his discussion of the way in which the ideas of the new covenant and a new *tōrā* arose—a theme which points ahead to the New Testament (p. 152ff). Thirdly, and more briefly, the meaning which the author assigns to *tōrā* in some passages is open to question—for example, in such Psalm passages as i 2; xix 8; cxix; where he seems to prefer to interpret *tōrā* as meaning oral instruction rather than written law (p. 119f).

This study is illustrated with a wealth of material drawn from the Old Testament and from ancient Near Eastern sources. The assembling of such a mass of material, and a clear presentation of the conclusions drawn from it, call for a high degree of skill, and it is here that a final criticism must be made. In reading the book the reviewer has felt that the argument frequently lies buried beneath the weight of the supporting evidence. This lack of clarity in the presentation of the argument makes the book a difficult one to read—sometimes indeed the reader is left in some doubt as to whether he has fully understood what the author intends to say. This is the more to be regretted, for, as has been indicated, the author, while he expounds some views which will not readily win assent, has something of interest and value to contribute.

Cambridge. D. WINTON THOMAS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- EKLUND, RAGNAR, *Life Between Death and Resurrection According to Islam*. Inaugural Dissertation. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri A-B., 1941; Pp. vii—188.
- ENGNELL, IVAN, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, A-B., 1943; xii—249.
- HALDAR, ALFRED, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites*. Inaugural Dissertation. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, A-B., 1945; Pp. 247.
- LÖFGREN, OSCAR, PH.D., ED., *Ambrosian Fragments of an Illuminated Manuscript containing the Zoology of Al-Gāhiz*. With a contribution: LAMM CARL J., Ph.D., *The Miniatures: Their Origin and Style*. Uppsala, A-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz (1946), Pp. 38.=Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1946: 5.
- R.P. SERRANO, LUCIANO, O.S.B., *Los Conversos D. Pablo de Santa Maria y Alfonso de Cartagena*. Madrid, 1942; Pp. 331.=Consejo Superior de Investigaciones científicas Patronato M. Menendez y Pelayo. Instituto Arias Montano — Escuela de Estudios Hebraicos, Serie B Nr. 1.
- VIÑAYO GONZALEZ A., *San Martín De León y su Apologetica Antijudia*. Prologo del R.P.R.G. VILLOSLADA, S.I. Madrid-Barcelona. Instituto Arias Montano de Estudios Hebraicos y Oriente Proximo, 1948; Pp. 311.
- WIDENGREN, G., *The Great Vohu Manah Apostle of God, Studies in Iranian and Manichaean Religion*. Uppsala, A-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz (1945); Pp. 95.=Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1945: 5; Price Kr. 3:60.

PERIODICALS

- The Jewish Quarterly Review*. Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, Vol. XXXVIII (1948), No. 4 (April).
- Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, Société Scientifique de Bruxelles et l'Union Catholique des scientifiques français. Louvain—Paris, 1948, 20 Jan.—20 April.
- Sefarad*, Revista del Instituto Arias Montano de Estudios Hebraicos y Oriente Proximo.= Consejo Superior de Investigaciones científicas, Madrid-Barcelona. A. VII, 1947. Fasc. 2.